



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMPTON CENTER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1850
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/923,612	09/04/1997	SETHURAMAN SURESH	SI/0014.01	2793

22470 7590 03/07/2007
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP
P O BOX 366
HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2166

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/923,612

Applicant(s)

SURESH ET AL.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2166

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1. Examiner acknowledges applicant's response filed on 1/2/2007.
2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee Set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/10/2004 has been entered, office action was mailed on 9/1/2006.
3. Claims 1-25,27-30 are pending in this application.
4. Claim 26 has been cancelled.

Specification

5. In view of applicant's amendment to the "Abstract", the objection as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Drawings

6. The drawings filed on 09/04/1997 are approved for examination purposes.

Priority

7. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged based on the provisional application **60/043,593** filed on 4/15/1997.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The information disclosure statement filed on 4/6/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, [*applicant submitted non-patent literature documents on CD*] and has been considered and a copy [PTO-1449 three pages] is enclosed with this office action.

9. The information disclosure statement filed on 2/10/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, and has been considered and a copy was enclosed with previous Office Action, however, on page 7/15, "PTO-1449" is not considered because it is "not prior art"

10. Applicant filed "Information disclosure statement" on 2/6/1999 and 8/26/1999 are exactly the same [duplicate], however, examiner notes that in the IDS filed on 8/26/1999, US Patent No. "5,694,990" should be US Patent "5,684,990" [typographical error]. Further, PTO-1449 filed on 2/6/1999 was considered and mailed with the previous office action.

Double Patenting

11. Examiner considered applicant's remarks at page 8 though 14, in view of applicant's arguments at page 8 though 14, the provisional rejection of claims 1-25,27-30 as set forth in the previous office action is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. **Claims 1-25, 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Crozier US Patent No. 5701423* in view of *Norin et al. [hereafter Norin]*, *US Patent No. 5794253***

14. As to claim 1, Crozier teaches a system which including 'in a system providing one dataset in communication with another dataset, a method for synchronizing datasets' [col 3, line 31-33, fig 1], Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciling or

Art Unit: 2166

synchronizing databases for example synchronizing data records between handheld computer and desktop computer as detailed in fig 1, examiner interpreting datasets are integral part of both handheld and desktop computer because both handheld and desktop computer have records related to for example hone, schedule, to-do memo from handheld computer, and personal information, spreadsheet manager, word processing manager from desktop computer; :

'receiving a request specifying synchronization of information records of a source dataset residing on a first device with information records of a target dataset residing on a second device' [col 3, line 31-37, fig 1], Crozier specifically teaches sharing data, dynamically reconciliation and resolving conflicts between handheld computer and desktop computer as detailed in fig 1, col 3, line 31-37, information records of a source dataset residing on a first device corresponds to Crozier's fig 1, element 101, second device corresponds to fig 1, element 115;

determining a synchronization set by: (i) determining which, if any, information records have been previously transmitted to the target dataset but no longer exists at the source dataset' [col 5, line 9-17, line 39-42], Crozier specifically teaches mapping of the fields between handheld, desktop devices, translation of data between both devices, and transfer of data between two devices as detailed in fig 1, furthermore, Crozier also suggests dynamically reconciling the records and resolving the conflicts between handheld and desktop data as detailed in col 5, line 39-42;

(ii) determining which, if any, information records have been added to or modified at the source dataset since the source dataset was last synchronized with the target dataset' [col 11, line 62-67, col 12, line 1-8, fig 7], Crozier specifically suggests if the data in any given field is different, update to the field, or edit part or all of the data in the record and write it to the target database as detailed in col 12, line 1-8;

wherein each information record of the source dataset is assigned a unique identifier that is independent of either of the devices, for identifying said each information record at both the source dataset and the target dataset, said unique identifier being maintained in a device-independent record map that allows the unique identifier to be traced back to a specific information record regardless of which device the specific information record resides' [col 8, line 10-38], Crozier specifically teaches mapping between handheld, desktop computer records specifying the both handheld, desktop applications, further, Crozier also suggests handheld database file that specifies "record number", i.e., assigning "unique record id " defining the uniqueness of the record as detailed in col 8, line 10-38; 'based on said synchronization set, synchronizing information records of the source dataset with information records of the target dataset' [col 11, line 32-39], Crozier specifically suggests dynamic reconciliation between handheld computer to the desktop computer that including mapping of record fields between source dataset and target dataset as detailed in col 11, line 32-39]

(i) using said unique identifiers, deleting from the target dataset any information records which have been previously transmitted to the target dataset but no longer exist at the source dataset' [col 9, table 1, line 10-11], Crozier specifically

suggests updating the target field table for specified handheld or source field as detailed in col 9, line 10-11;

(ii) using said unique identifiers, updating the target dataset so that said target dataset includes those information records determined to have been added to or modified at the source dataset since the source dataset was last synchronized with the target dataset' [col 11, line 40-48, line 49-61]. It is however, noted that Crozier does not specifically teach "globally unique identifier", although Crozier specifically teaches record number in source dataset and target data set specifies "unique record ID" [see Crozier: col 8, line 22-25]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 64-66].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because both Crozier, and Norin are directed to "synchronizing data sets from source and target, more specifically Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciliation or synchronizing data records between desktop and handheld computer as detailed in fig 1, col 11, 32-39], while Norin also suggests synchronizing and replication of data sets or data objects in a distributing network [see fig 1, col 2, line 44-50, col 8, line 13-26], and both Crozier, Norin specifically teaches "data set or data records is assigned unique ID" [Crozier: col 8, line 22-25; Norin: col 9, line 49-50, line 53-54].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because that would have allowed users of Crozier to globally synchronizing clock value as part of the data set ID that identifier uniquely data records across source and target databases, further replication list also containing additional information indicating replication of the data set and a time last modified stamp indicating the time the replica state was last modified as suggested by Norin et al. [col 10, line 22-28] bringing the advantages of highly flexible replication process where time based expiration can be tailored individually for each source and target database [col 6, line 15-16].

15. As to claim 2, Crozier disclosed 'each dataset comprises a database table having a plurality of data records' [fig 2, element 103, element 200,col 6, line 31-34].

16. As to claim 3, Crozier disclosed 'wherein each dataset comprises an electronic address book listing contact information' [fig 3, element 121, col 7, line 18-24].

17. As to claim 4, Crozier disclosed 'wherein each dataset comprises an electronic schedule listing scheduling information' [col 7, line 10-13, fig 1, element 105].

18. As to claim 5, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifiers are created by the system regardless of whether the source dataset includes existing record identifiers' [col 9, line 53-59, line 62-67, col 10, line 1-4].

19. As to claim 6, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifiers are maintained in a record map stored apart from the source dataset' col 10, line 5-7].

20. As to claim 7, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier for each record comprises a timestamp which is assigned to the record when the record is initially processed by the system' [col 9, line 56-59].

21. As to claim 8, Norin disclosed 'each globally unique identifier is a 32-bit value' [col 9, line 66-67].

22. As to claim 9, Crozier disclosed 'synchronizing the information records of the target dataset with information records of the source dataset by designating the source dataset as the target dataset, designating the target dataset as the source dataset, and repeating said determining step and said synchronizing step' [col 7, line 56-68].

23. As to claim 10, Crozier disclosed 'synchronization set comprises a delete order specifying particular information records to delete at the target dataset' [table 1, col 9, line 10-11].

Art Unit: 2166

24. As to claim 11, Crozier disclosed 'delete order includes a list of unique identifiers for particular information records to delete at the target dataset' [col 8, line 22-25, col 11, line 32-39, line 44-48]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 65].

25. As to claim 12, Crozier disclosed 'synchronization set comprises an extraction record specifying particular information to add to or modify at the target dataset' [col 7, line 45-54].

26. As to claim 13, Crozier disclosed 'extraction record includes at least one unique identifier together with field information for the particular information to add to or modify at the target dataset' [col 8, line 10-31]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed globally unique identifier' [col 9, line 65].

27. As to claim 14, Crozier disclosed 'excluding certain information records from participating in synchronization by applying a user-defined filter' [col 12, line 39-51, table 3].

28. As to claim 15-16, Crozier disclosed 'user-defined filter comprises an outbound filter applied to information records prior to creation of the synchronization set' [col 14, line 1-6].

Art Unit: 2166

29. As to claim 17, Crozier disclosed 'user-defined filter comprises a user-supplied filtering routine supplying filtering logic' [col 14, line 1-17].

30. As to claim 18-19, Crozier disclosed 'target dataset resides at a remote location relative to the source dataset' [col 15, line 29-34, fig 1].

31. As to claim 20, Norin disclosed 'synchronization set is transmitted to the remote location using an electronic messaging communication protocol' [col 1, line 45-51].

32. As to claim 21, Crozier teaches a system which including 'a synchronization system comprising: means for connecting a first device having a first dataset to a second device having a second dataset [fig 1, Abstract], first device having a first dataset corresponds to handheld computer fig 1, element 101; second device having a second dataset corresponds to fig 1, element 115 because both handheld computer, and desktop computer have database records as detailed in fig 1; synchronization corresponds to Crozier's dynamic reconciliation;

means for determining information of said first and second datasets which requires synchronization' [col 3, line 31-33, col 4, line line 53-57], Crozier specifically teaches dynamic reconciliation between source dataset and target dataset for example as detailed in fig 1-2;

(i) means for determining for each dataset [fig 1-2, element 103, 200] information which has been previously received from the other dataset but which no longer exists at the other dataset [col 5, line 9-17, line 39-42], Crozier specifically teaches mapping of the fields between handheld, desktop devices, translation of data between both devices, and transfer of data between two devices as detailed in fig 1, furthermore, Crozier also suggests dynamically reconciling the records and resolving the conflicts between handheld and desktop data as detailed in col 5, line 39-42

(ii) means for determining for each dataset information which has been added or modified at the other dataset since the other dataset was last synchronized with said each dataset [col 11, line 62-67, col 12, line 1-8, fig 7], Crozier specifically suggests if the data in any given field is different, update to the field, or edit part or all of the data in the record and write it to the target database as detailed in col 12, line 1-8;

means, responsive to said determining means, for synchronizing said first and second datasets [fig 1-2, col 3, line 31-37], Crozier specifically teaches dynamically reconciling two database files that corresponds to first and second datasets as detailed in col 3, line 31-33;

wherein said information of said first and second datasets comprises data records [fig 1-2], first and second datasets comprises data records corresponds to fig 2, element 103, 105, 107, 109, 111, and 237, 239, 241, and 243; and wherein said means for determining include means for assigning to each data record a device-independent

Art Unit: 2166

unique identifier created by the system for uniquely identifying each data record regardless of which dataset and device it appears' [col 8, line 10-38], Crozier specifically teaches mapping between handheld, desktop computer records specifying the both handheld, desktop applications, further, Crozier also suggests handheld database file that specifies "record number", i.e., assigning "unique record id " defining the uniqueness of the record as detailed in col 8, line 10-38.

It is however, noted that Crozier does not specifically teach "globally unique identifier", although Crozier specifically teaches record number in source dataset and target data set specifies "unique record ID" [see Crozier: col 8, line 22-25]. On the other hand, Norin disclosed 'globally unique identifier" [col 9, line 64-66].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because both Crozier, and Norin are directed to "synchronizing data sets from source and target, more specifically Crozier is directed to dynamically reconciliation or synchronizing data records between desktop and handheld computer as detailed in fig 1, col 11, 32-39], while Norin also suggests synchronizing and replication of data sets or data objects in a distributing network [see fig 1, col 2, line 44-50, col 8, line 13-26], and both Crozier, Norin specifically teaches "data set or

Art Unit: 2166

data records is assigned unique ID" [Crozier: col 8, line 22-25; Norin: col 9, line 49-50, line 53-54].

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because that would have allowed users of Crozier to globally synchronizing clock value as part of the data set ID that identifier uniquely data records across source and target databases, further replication list also containing additional information indicating replication of the data set and a time last modified stamp indicating the time the replica state was last modified as suggested by Norin et al. [col 10, line 22-28] bringing the advantages of highly flexible replication process where time based expiration can be tailored individually for each source and target database [col 6, line 15-16].

33. As to claim 22, Crozier disclosed 'wherein at least one of said devices is a hand-held computing device' [fig 1-2, element 101].

34. As to claim 23, Crozier disclosed 'wherein at least one of said devices is desktop computing device' [fig 1-2, element 115].

35. As to claim 24, Norin disclosed 'means for connecting includes a Transmission Control Protocol/ Internet Protocol (TCP/IP) connection' [col 8, line 60-64].

Art Unit: 2166

36. As to claim 25, Crozier disclosed 'synchronizing operates to provide bi-directional synchronization of the datasets' [col 7, line 65-67].

37. As to claim 27, Crozier disclosed 'filter means for selectively blocking synchronization of certain types of information' [col 12, line 39-42]..

38. As to claim 28, Crozier disclosed 'filter means operates based on how old information is' [fig 6, col 8, line 39-42].

39. As to claim 29, Crozier disclosed 'filter means operates based on particular information content' [table 3, col 12, line 20-39].

40. As to claim 30, Norin disclosed 'electronic mail transport means for enabling synchronization of remote datasets' [col 1, line 45-51, col 2, line 44-50].

Response to Arguments

41. Applicant's arguments filed on 1/2/2007 with respect to claims 1-25,27-30 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

a) At page 16, claim 1, applicant argues that The pseudo code in Table 3 from column 12 shows that Crozier performs a brute force comparison of records on the handheld and desktop platforms. There is no selection of a synchronization set.

As to the above argument [a], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Crozier is directed to "dynamically reconciling data" between two computers, particularly, between handheld, and desktop computers [see fig 1, col 3, line 31-33], secondly, Crozier suggests mapping between source and destination fields of each record structure that including translation of records [col 3, line 66-67, col 4, line 1-1-4], thirdly, Crozier also suggests if the data in any given field is different, update to the field, ignore or edit part or all of the data for "reconciliation" purpose" because translation takes place between two computer database records that corresponds to selection of specific data fields for reconciliation or synchronization as detailed in col 11, line 62-67, col 12, line 1-8, fig 7, therefore, Crozier teaches selection of a synchronization set between two databases.

b) At page 16, claim 1, applicant argues that “reconciliation, as Crozier describes the process, is NOT “based on (a) synchronization set” because Crozier does not determine a synchronization set before applying the pseudo code of table 3”.

As to the argument [b], examiner disagree with the applicant because Crozier specifically teaches synchronization set between two databases particularly records between handheld and desktop with capabilities to accept, ignore, or change data, also as noted from table 3, Crozier does suggests based on synchronization set because handheld, desktop records are continuously compared, translated to generate synchronous set.

c) At page 16, claim 1, applicant argues that “the examiner’s reference (OA at 11) to a unique record id in the MAPPING database, taken from col 8, line 10-25, relates to mapping records, not to information records.

d) At page 16, claim 1, applicant argues “Crozier uses a key or range key that reflects data values, not a unique identifier for information records’

As to the above argument [c-d], as best understood by the examiner, each record number is identified as “unique record id” of the record in the mapping database as detailed in col 8, line 22-25 corresponds to “information records”, further it is noted that mapping is a “bi-directional” applicable both handheld and desktop computers and desktop to handheld computer as detailed in col 7, line 59-67, also fig 9-10 is an example[s] of field mapping database, but not on key or range key based.

e) At page 16, claim 1, applicant argues that "Norin's Globally Unique ID (GUID) names a data set, not an information record.

As to the above argument [e], examiner disagree with the applicant because, Norin specifically teaches not only generating Globally Unique ID (GUID) [col 9, line 64-65], but also each data set ID is an identifier that uniquely identifies the data set across the replication enterprise [col 9, line 53-55], further, each data set is defined by set of properties for example data set ID, data set name and like as detailed in col 9, line 49-50 corresponds to any information record because typically any record in the database would have record attributes is common knowledge in the database art, therefore, data set corresponds to information record.

f) At page 17, claim 1, applicant argues that as neither reference supplies the globally unique identifier of the information record element, neither does the combination.

In response to applicant's argument [f] that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2166

the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Crozier is directed to mapping, translating, dynamically reconciling data between handheld and desktop computers [see fig 1], more specifically dynamically reconcile the information of two database files [col 3, line 31-33], also Crozier specifically teaches translating record structure between source and target databases because source and target databases not required to be of same type, therefore, translation between two record structures required using mapping to translate the data between the two structures [col 3, line 56-59, fig 9], further, Crozier also teaches "unique record id" that specifically identifies unique record for mapping purposes [col 8, line 22-25]. On the other hand, Norin is directed to "replication enterprise", more specifically, synchronizing and replication of data sets or data objects in a distributing network environment [see fig 1, col 2, line 4-50, col 8, line 13-26], also it is noted that both Crozier, Norin specifically teaches "data set or data records is assigned unique ID [see Crozier: col 8, line 22-25, Norin: col 9, line 49-50], as explained, both Crozier, Norin suggests "synchronization".

One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Norin et al. into mapping, translating, and dynamically reconciling data between handheld computer and desktop computer of Crozier because that would have allowed users of Crozier to globally synchronizing clock value as part of the data set ID that identifier uniquely data records across source and target databases, further replication list also containing additional information indicating replication of the

Art Unit: 2166

data set and a time last modified stamp indicating the time the replica state was last modified as suggested by Norin et al. [col 10, line 22-28] bringing the advantages of highly flexible replication process where time based expiration can be tailored individually for each source and target database [col 6, line 15-16].

g) At page 17, claim 2, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.....

As to the above argument [g], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically teaches handheld database have data records related to phone, schedule, to-do, data, memory as detailed in fig 1, element 103, element 200, col 6, line 31-34;

h) At page 17, claim 3, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.....

As to the above argument [h], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically teaches phone records have various attributes or fields that including name, number, address and like as detailed in fig 3, col 7, line 18-24.

Art Unit: 2166

i) At page 17, claim 4, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin....

As to the above argument [i], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically teaches "electronic schedule information as detailed in fig 1, element 105, col 7, line 10-13.

j) At page 18, claim 5, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.....

As to the above argument [j], as best understood by the examiner, at least Norin specifically teaches "global unique identifier or GUID as detailed in col 9, line 53-59, line 62-67, col 10, line 1-4.

k) At page 18, claim 6, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.

As to the above argument [k], as best understood by the examiner, Norin specifically teaches "global Unique ID or (GUID) associated with the record, while FUID is created in relation with GUID to identify version for the data set properties by incrementing every time in ID value [col 10, line 5-7].

Art Unit: 2166

l) At page 18, claim 7, applicant argues that there is no teaching in Norin to use a timestamp as part of a globally unique identifier for an information records assigned when the record is initially processed.

As to the above argument [l], Norin specifically teaches “globally synchronized clock value as part of the ID related to data set ID because data set ID is an identifier that uniquely identifies the data set across the replication [col 9, line 56-59].

m) At page 19, claim 8, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.

As to the above argument [m], as best understood by the examiner, Norin specifically suggests “global unique identifier is a unique 16 byte value create by concatenating a 60 bit system value as detailed in col 9, line 66-67, col 10, line 1.

n) At page 19, claim 9, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.

As to the above argument [n], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically suggests mapping database fields between handheld and desktop computer particularly mapping is a bi-directional for dynamically reconciling data between desktop and handheld as detailed in col 7, line 56-68.

o) At page 19, claim 10, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin. Crozier table says nothing about a delete order.

As to the above argument [o], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically suggests updating data between handheld and desktop particularly update desktop field table for specified handheld field [table 1, col 9, line 10-11] corresponds to specifying particular information records to delete .

p) At page 19, claim 11, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin....generally, col 8 relates to the records in a mapping table, as explained above, not to information records

As to the above argument [p], as best understood by the examiner, as explained above, Crozier does suggests "updating" data between handheld and desktop particularly specified fields, further examiner interpreting dataset corresponds to information records Crozier [col 8, line 22-25, col 11, line 32-39, line 44-48].

q) At page 20, claim 12, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin...examiner relies, relates to the building a mapping table, not to synchronization sets or extraction records.

As to the above argument [q], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically teaches translation and mapping specific fields between handheld and desktop database for dynamically reconciling data as detailed in col 7, line 45-54.

r) At page 20, claim 13, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin...examiner relies relates to mapping of fields

As to the above argument [r], it is noted that Crozier specifically teaches mapping database fields between desktop database and handheld database, particularly each record number specifies the unique record id of the record extracted from respective databases as detailed in col 8, line 10-31.

s) At page 20, claim 14, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin...no user-defined filter is applied to exclude records from synchronization.

As to the above argument [s], it is noted that Crozier specifically suggest query is applied to database records particularly, satisfying both common record structure dissimilar to the records structure of both files and fields that are subject to record structure rules as detailed in col 12, line 39-51.

t) At page 20-21, claims 15-16, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin...nothing to do with the claimed limitations.

As to the above argument [t], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically suggests "querying" schedule information reconciliation between source and target database particularly involving applying query to specified fields as detailed in col 14, line 1-6.

u) At page 21, claim 17, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin...neither of which have anything to do with the claimed limitations

As to the above argument [u], Crozier suggests querying schedule information, particularly schedule reconciliation program applied to each appointment obtained from the handheld to the schedule map table , further applying to multiple records being produced that corresponds to filtering routine supplying filtering logic as detailed in col 14, line 1-17.

Examiner applies above arguments to claims 18-19 as they depend from claim 1.

v) At page 22-23, claim 21, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.

Art Unit: 2166

As to the above argument [v], examiner applies claim 1 arguments to the extent that applies, further examiner presented claim 21 rejection in the previous office action addressing all the elements.

Examiner applies above arguments to claims 22-24 as they depend from claim 21.

w) At page 22, claim 25, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin.....pseudo code does not provide bi-directional synchronization.....

As to the above argument [w], as best understood by the examiner, Crozier specifically suggests dynamic reconciling of data files between source and target database are bi-directional including mapping applicable both source and target systems as detailed in col 7, line 65-67.

x) At page 22-23, claim 27, applicant argues that these limitations are not found in Crozier in view of Norin at least the same reasons as claim 21 and reasons given for claims 14-17....

Examiner applies above arguments of claim 21, claims 14-17

Art Unit: 2166

y) At page 23, claim 29, examiner applies the above arguments as claim 21, claim 14-17, similarly examiner applies above arguments to claim 30 depend from claim 21.

Therefore, applicant's remarks are deemed not to be persuasive, and claims 1-25, 27-30 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crozier in view of Norin et al.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- | | | |
|----|----------------|---------|
| a. | US Patent. No. | 5701423 |
| b. | US Patent No.. | 5794253 |

42. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

sc
Patent Examiner.
March 1, 2007.



SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
PRIMARY EXAMINER